IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.R.UDAYABHANU

MONDAY, THE 18TH JUNE 2007 / 28TH JYAISHTA 1929

Crl.Rev.Pet.No. 611 of 1999()

CRA.178/1996 of SESSIONS COURT, THRISSUR DT.30.6.99
CC.76/1995 of JUDL. MAGISTRATE OF FIRST CLASS COURT, KODUNGALLUR

.....

REVN. PETITIONER: APPELLANT/ ACCUSED

ABDUL KARIM,
S/O.AMMU KUNNATH HOUSE,
PULLUT DESOM, KODUNGALLUR.

BY ADV. SRI.JOHN K.GEORGE
SRI.TITUS DOMINIC

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

STATE OF KERALA, REP.BY
PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA.

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI.C.K.SURESH

THIS CRIMINAL REVISION PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 18 / 06 / 2007 , THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

K.R. UDAYABHANU, J.

CRL.R.P.NO.611 of 1999

DATED THIS THE 18TH JUNE 2007

ORDER

The revision petitioner stands convicted for the offences under Sections 448 and 506(1) I.P.C. and sentenced, as modified by the appellate court, to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- and in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two weeks for the offence under Section 448 I.P.C. and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- and in default to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month for the offence under Section 506(1) IPC and that out of the fine amount, if realised, a sum of Rs.2,000/- shall be paid to the de facto complainant.

2. The prosecution case is that on 13-1-1995 at about 11 a.m. the accused trespassed into the office room of the Principal of K.K.T.M.College and intimidated PW1, the Principal.

3. The evidence adduced in the matter consisted of the testimony of Pws.1 to 6 of whom PW.1 is the de facto complainant and Pws.2 and 3, the Junior Superintendent and Clerk attached to the office of the college. Pws.2 and 3 have supported the version of PW1. PW1 has deposed that disciplinary action had been initiated against the children of the accused who was studying in the college which according to him was the motive. PW5, the Professor of the particular

college has also deposed that he saw the accused rushing out of the room of the Principal while he was walking along the corridor of the college.

In the light of the evidence adduced in the matter, I find that concurrent findings of the courts below did not call for any interference. The conviction and sentence is confirmed. The revision petition is dismissed.

K.R.UDAYABHANU, JUDGE

ks.

K.R.UDAYABHANU, J

CRL.R.P.NO.611 of 1999

ORDER

18-6-2007